## 

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

ANDRE M. INGRAM

Case No. 2:18-cv-01939-GMN-DJA

Plaintiffs.

**ORDER** 

v.

CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT, et al.,

Defendants.

This matter is before the Court on Defendant Clark County School District's Motion to Extend Discovery Deadlines (ECF No. 55), filed on August 2, 2019 and Motion to Compel Plaintiff's Discovery Responses (ECF No. 56), filed on August 6, 2019. Any response opposing the Motions were due on August 16, 2019 and August 20, 2019, respectively. No response has been filed to date.

The Court notes that, on July 18, 2019, it recommended that Plaintiff's case be dismissed without prejudice because he appears to have abandoned the case by not filing an amended complaint. Defendant now requests a short 30 days extension of the current discovery deadlines out of an abundance of caution while it awaits a decision on the Court's recommendation. (ECF No. 55). In addition, Defendant seeks an order compelling Plaintiff to respond to its written discovery including: First Set of Interrogatories pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 33, which contain four interrogatories and First Set of Requests for Production of Documents pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 34, which contain thirteen requests. (ECF No. 56). Finally, Defendant seeks an order compelling Plaintiff to appear for his properly noticed deposition pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 30. (*Id.*).

Plaintiff has failed to file points and authorities in response to either motion, which "constitutes a consent to the granting of the motion." LR 7-2(d). Moreover, the Court finds good cause to grant the extension of the discovery for 30 days to permit Defendant to continue its efforts to obtain the requested discovery. Likewise, the Court finds that Plaintiff's failure to

respond to Defendant's written discovery requests and appear for his properly noticed deposition violative of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and warrants an order to compel. Rule 33 requires the responding party to serve its answers or any objections within 30 days after being served with written interrogatories. Rule 34 requires a party upon whom document requests are served to respond in writing within 30 days after being served with the requests. The "failure to object to discovery requests within the time required constitutes a waiver of any objection." *Richmark Corp. v. Timber Falling Consultants*, 959 F.2d 1468, 1473 (9th Cir. 1992); *see also Haddad v. Interstate Management Co., LLC*, 2012 WL 398764, \* 1 (D. Nev. 2012) (same). Here, Plaintiff has failed to object to Defendant's discovery requests within the period of time prescribed by the Rules; therefore, Plaintiff has waived any right to object to the requests. Plaintiff shall provide responses to Defendant's written discovery within 30 days of the Court order, without objections. Additionally, Plaintiff shall appear for his deposition, to be properly noticed by Defendant.

Finally, the Court denies without prejudice Defendant's request for attorneys' fees and costs incurred in bringing the Motion to Compel (ECF No. 56). Plaintiff's complete failure to participate in the discovery process, by not appearing for his deposition or responding to written discovery, is not substantially justified. However, an award of fees may be unjust given the Court's pending recommendation to dismiss this action. The denial of Defendant's request for fees is without prejudice to be renewed to the extent the case proceeds and Plaintiff continues to not participate in discovery.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant Clark County School District's Motion to Extend Discovery Deadlines (ECF No. 55) is **granted**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant Clark County School District's Motion to Compel Plaintiff's Discovery Responses (ECF No. 56) is **granted in part and denied in part**.

DATED: October 2, 2019

DANIEL J. ALBREGTS

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE